UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,298	06/08/2006	Rudolf Berger	72.107	5075
	7590 04/30/200 RICKSON S.C.	EXAMINER		
840 North Planl	kinton Avenue	SMITH, SCOTT A		
MILWAUKEE, WI 53203			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3721	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/30/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@boylefred.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/596,298	BERGER ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Scott A. Smith	3721
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Description of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 A</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/ Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	awn from consideration. or election requirement.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by the lead of a cepted or b) for objected to by the lead of a cepted of the drawing o	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat* * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicationity documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

Art Unit: 3721

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/6/09 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the guide device is disposed between the handle and housing that allows relatively uninhibited movement of the handle device relative to the handle housing in the working direction. However, this mode of operation is not originally set forth in the specification. Such conditions can be inferred, but such disclosure is not explicitly set forth. In fact, the specification teaches the contrary. For example, on page 7, lines 15-17, the guide device is disclosed as enabling a guiding of the handle relative to the housing transverse to the working direction, as well as in a rotational direction. Also, on page 8, lines18-21, the rollers are disclosed as being elastic such as to allow such transverse

Art Unit: 3721

movement between the handle and housing. Further, the spring 13 would also be effective to inhibit longitudinal movement of the handle relative to the housing. This being contradictory to the claims as amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 5. Claim 15 appears to be inaccurate since it recites that the guide device is positioned nearer the tool receptacle than the handle device. The handle device is disclosed as being element 1, which receives the rollers fully within the interior thereof; i.e. the front most portion of the handle device 1 is closer to the receptacle than any of the rollers. Claim 16 also appears to be inaccurate since it recites that the rollers are nearer the first end of the hammer housing than the second end. However, the rear most guide rollers 8,9 are closer to the housing rear end than the housing front end. In claim 18, line 2, "or" should be changed to "of" for clarity.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 3721

7. Claims 1-5 and 9-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harada et al. '466.

Harada et al. '466 discloses the percussion drill hammer as claimed comprising a hammer housing 1, 15, a handle device surrounding at least a portion of the housing and including a handle 2, 12, and a guide device including rolling elements 4 effectively "fastened" between the hammer housing and the handle device located laterally on the housing, as broadly claimed, and effecting a spring characteristic transverse to a working direction, wherein the guide device allows relatively uninhibited movement of the handle relative to the housing in a working direction and inhibits lateral and rotational movement between the handle and housing, as broadly claimed.

8. Claims 1-5 and 9-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by UK Patent Application '045.

UK Patent Application '045 discloses the percussion drill hammer as claimed comprising a hammer housing 1, 3, a handle device including a handle 2 with guide portions 2a which overlap an outer surface of the housing portion at 3, and a guide device including rolling elements 7 effective between the hammer housing and the handle device in an intermediate space and located laterally on the housing and movable along "track" 2b of the handle device, as broadly claimed, and effecting a spring characteristic transverse to a working direction, wherein the guide device allows relatively uninhibited movement of the handle relative to the housing in a working direction and inhibits lateral and rotational movement between the handle and housing, as broadly claimed.

Art Unit: 3721

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 10. Claims 5-8, 10-13, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harada et al. '466 or UK Patent Application '045 in view of Dunn '014.

Harada et al. '466 and UK Patent Application '045 lack the specifically claimed rolling elements and "tracks". Dunn '014 discloses a related reciprocating tool comprising a handle 12 guided reciprocably upon a tool member 11,31, and a guide device including rolling members 30 in cooperating tracks 33, 32 between the handle and tool member. In view of the teachings of Dunn '014, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the devices of Harada et al. '466 or UK Patent Application '045 with the specifically claimed rolling elements and tracks for the guide arrangement in order to more effectively guide the elements, as well as being configured with a prismatic shape.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See the attached PTO-892 for related art.

Art Unit: 3721

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott A. Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-4469. The examiner can normally be reached on 5:30-4:00 Tues.-Fri..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi Rada can be reached on 571-272-4467. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

S. Smith

/Scott A. Smith/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3721